



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

persuaded—I might say forced—the dominant party to adopt that measure; and in the same spirit of liberality they opposed the proposition to disfranchise a large number of their white neighbors who had been engaged in rebellion. Next to their devotion to the Union, their desire for peace and good government in the South through a liberal policy by the victorious party was the aim and hope of these men. Then came reconstruction and the reorganization of political parties in the South. It must be written that the National Republican party, controlled by Northern politicians, in the exercise of its powerful political influence and the bestowal of its great patronage, in every Southern State and in almost every instance rejected the counsels of these brave and experienced men, and sought to build upon three elements only—the negro, the carpet-bagger, and a few new converts from the Confederate element. This is the only blur upon the otherwise magnificent record of that party.

W. W. MILLS.

## II.

### TAXATION OR NON-TAXATION FOR CHURCHES.

THE RECENT adoption by the Constitutional Convention of the new State of Washington of a provision requiring the taxation of all church property opens anew the question whether the time-honored policy of exempting churches and charitable institutions from their share in the ordinary burdens of the State is, after all, the wisest one to be pursued, and has a substantial foundation in common-sense. The argument most frequently heard in favor of exemption is that the practice is well established and has worked so well thus far in the world's history that any change of a revolutionary character would not only be unwise, but deeply injurious to the churches and the cause of religion generally. The wiser thought of the time, however, strongly favors a complete separation of church and state. The contention in favor of leaving charitable institutions free from taxation rests on a different basis from that which is applicable to churches, since the former may reasonably be considered to be of at least direct potential benefit to all the members of the community. There is a very large class of citizens who have no sympathy with the churches as such, but who, nevertheless, are compelled to bear their share of supporting them. There is an element of positive injustice in this, which the American people should be quick to perceive and resent.

Really, is not the plan of letting churches go free from tax-paying, on the ground that they act in a sense as a sort of moral police force, an old-fogy notion which the world has outgrown, and ought to have cast aside before this time? Consider for a moment how it is abused. Think of the enormous property owned by the Trinity Corporation in New York City, with which the Tax Department and the Board of Assessors have nothing to do, forsooth, because it is owned by a church! What an outrageous piece of injustice is this! Had a few other church enterprises gone into the same business, acquiring property on a large scale, without doubt the evil would have worked its own remedy long ago. For one I am glad to see the spirit that has been manifested in Washington. It is true that California has shown the way in this direction, and it is not apparent that the churches in that State have suffered on account of the policy there first put in operation. Some of the feeblar churches may be injuriously affected by the necessity of paying their share of the taxes, but on the whole the tendency will be to prevent the erection of churches which have no adequate cause for existence and no "visible means of support." As the majority of church-goers are, presumably, tax-payers, it will in the end make no difference to them whether the taxes come out of their pockets directly or indirectly; and as for non-church-goers, who under our wise laws have the same rights, liberties, and privileges as the most devout regular attendants on Sunday worship, they will no longer be required to submit to the compulsion of paying their share toward the support of institutions in which they feel little, if any, interest, even if they do not entertain toward them feelings of positive hostility. Common-sense, the American spirit of fair play, and the demands of justice and of right dealing between man and man, and between one corporation and another, all justify and require the abolition

of the antiquated and inequitable system of no taxation for churches. The Washington convention has taken a step in the right direction, and one that the people of that State ought to approve most heartily.

PHILO R. SYLVESTER.

### III.

#### SOME EARLY HARVARD CUSTOMS.

WHETHER or not a "fast set" now exists at Harvard University is for others to determine, but that such a "set" should have existed during the early decades of the institution seems well-nigh impossible. He must, indeed, have been a bold and reckless youth who would dare to defy the iron-clad, steel-barred regulations with which the early fathers of New England encased the youthful tendencies of the rising generation. That these restrictions were submitted to by students of sufficient age and ability to "make and speak true Latin in verse and prose," according to the early requirements for admission, and to use the language in familiar conversation, their own tongue being prohibited,—"*Scholares vernaculâ linguâ intra collegii limites, nullo prætextu, utuntur*,"—is as certain as it is incredible. And they have transmitted to us ample evidence of their sound principles and scholarly attainments, as well as of their mental and moral force, which acted so potently on the growing affairs of the colonies.

Corporal punishment by "boxing" and by stripes, which must not be "inhuman or immoderate," was sanctioned by law for many years. In the year 1656 it was ordered by law "that the president and fellows of Harvard College for the time being, or the major part of them, . . . are hereby empowered, according to their best discretion, to punish all misdemeanors of the youth in their society, either by fine or whipping in the hall openly, as the nature of the offence shall require, not exceeding ten shillings, or ten stripes for one offence." These punishments were administered with a gravity becoming the offence and the dignity of the college government.

In the diary of Judge Samuel Sewall, "the good and wise," is recorded an instance of such public punishment for "speaking blasphemous words." The guilty person was condemned to be "publicly whipped before all the scholars"; to be "suspended from taking his bachelor's degree and to sit alone by himself, uncovered, at meals, during the pleasure of the president and fellows." The sentence was twice read publicly, and, after prayer by the president, the stripes were inflicted, the offender kneeling, and the president concluded the exercises with solemn prayer. The law permitting corporal punishment was not abolished for more than a century after the establishment of the college.

According to the Dunster code of laws, prepared by the first president, all sophisters and bachelors, "until themselves made commonplace," were required not only to attend church, and to refrain from "gestures that might show contempt or neglect of God's ordinances," but to repeat publicly the sermons in the hall after service. They might not, without permission, connect themselves with the artillery or "train band," nor go out of town or "pragmatically intrude or intermeddle in other men's affairs." If the student were of "known gravity" and "of approved sober and virtuous conversation," and if the president so decreed, he might be allowed to join a military band.

Miscellaneous purchases, or moneyed transactions of any sort, to the value of a sixpence, were distinctly forbidden, without the allowance of parents, guardians, or tutors (the latter word is invariably spelled with a capital), and any contraband article so bought, sold, or exchanged was liable to forfeiture at the discretion of the president.

The use of tobacco, except by order of a physician, consent of parents, or permission of the president, was not allowed. If a physician's certificate procured the privilege, the fragrant weed might be indulged in "in a sober and private manner."

In the year 1722, the gay youth of the college were forbidden, during the exercises of commencement week, to prepare or provide any such luxurious and ungodly viands as "plum cake, or roasted, boiled, or baked meats," and even the use of "pies